

REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application. Further, Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C §119 and for accepting the formal drawings received on September 30, 2004.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-12 and 16 are pending in the present patent application. Claims 1 and 16 are independent. The remaining claims depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 1. Claims 1 and 16 have been amended. It is believed that no new subject matter has been added by the amendment set forth above.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-12 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,311,204 (hereinafter "Mills"). For the reasons set forth below, this rejection is respectively traversed.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation "the processor being further adapted to display the image file in one of the substantially original format and the converted image file dependent on constraints of the memory and processor." Mills teaches, among other things, an apparatus for providing video, audio, and graphics processing functions in a set top box, two pixel aspect ratios: a 9:8 aspect ratio and square pixel aspect ratio (1:1), with the possibility to convert from the first to the second (column 12, lines 58-63). However, Mills is completely silent as to the display of an "image file in one of the substantially original format and the converted image file dependent on constraints of the

memory and processor.” In fact, Mills is not concerned whether resources are available for display. Instead, Mills simply decides whether conversion between ratios is required.

Further, Mills does not teach that the decision to convert between ratios is based upon memory or processor constraints. Instead, Mills suggests that the memory capacity is not restrictive: “the capacity of the DRAM 40, Flash ROM 36 and other memory devices in processing system 10 may vary depending upon the memory requirements of a given application” (column 9, lines 23-26), and “[t]he present invention provides a number of graphics modes which require less memory and therefore free up large portions of memory” (column 12, lines 44-46). In Mills, *conversion is avoided* because of the irrevocable loss of bandwidth, unless there is a special reason for doing so, such as when displaying graphics designed for a square pixel platform (column 12, lines 48-65), but not because of any memory or processor constraints. Thus, Mills fails to disclose all the limitations recited in amended independent claims 1 and 16 of the present invention.

In regard to the Examiner’s Response to Arguments (*See* Office Action dated December 21, 2004 at page 5), the Applicant respectfully asserts that even if Mills should purportedly teach different buffers (column 10, lines 27-49), there is nothing in Mills that suggests that two versions of the image are stored *contemporaneously*. In fact, Mills suggests the opposite when he discloses conversion causes loss of bandwidth and thus, it should be done only when required by the application. In such a situation, there is no need to keep the original image considering the original image only takes up memory space without ever being useful following the conversion. It is for this reason, if using Mills, one skilled in the art would never store *both* images at once, but rather one at a time.

Moreover, the Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's assertion that Mills teaches that the decoding process is dependent on the capacity of the memory. Instead, the Applicant respectfully asserts that the opposite is disclosed in Mills - the memory capacity may vary dependent on the requirements of a given application (column 9, lines 21-26).


Thus, it is clear that amended independent claims 1 and 16 are patentable over Mills. Claims 2-12 depend, either directly or indirectly, from amended claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 11345/020001).

Dated: February 22, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Jonathan P. Osha
Registration No.: 33,986
OSHA & MAY L.L.P.
1221 McKinney, Suite 2800
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant

Attachments



Application No. (if known): 09/622,245

Attorney Docket No.: 11345/020001

Certificate of Express Mailing Under 37 CFR 1.10

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as Express Mail, Airbill No. EV534540839US, in an envelope addressed to:

MS AMENDMENT
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on February 22, 2005
Date

Signature

Brenda C. McFadden

Typed or printed name of person signing Certificate

Registration Number, if applicable

(713) 228-8600
Telephone Number

Note: Each paper must have its own certificate of mailing, or this certificate must identify each submitted paper.

Response to Final Office Action dated December 21, 2004